

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11, 13-28, 30, and 32 remain pending in the present application, including independent claims 1, 10, and 19. Independent claim 1, for instance, is directed to an elastomeric article comprising an ultra-thin outer layer that comprises an acrylic-based polymer. The ultra-thin outer layer has a thickness of between about 0.25 and about 1.5 microns. The article also comprises a base polymer layer adjacent and attached to the ultra-thin outer layer. The base polymer comprises an elastomeric material that has been coagulated on the ultra-thin outer layer.

In the Office Action, independent claims 1, 10, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,284,856 to Lee. Lee is directed to acrylic-based copolymers that coat and firmly adhere to a surface of a rubber article. A typical thickness for natural or nitrile latex rubber articles is from about 150 to 250 microns (~ 6 to 10 mils).¹ Neoprene latex rubber articles are generally thicker, up to about 760 microns (~ 30 mils). In addition, the preferred thickness of the copolymer coatings is between about 3 and 10 microns. (Col. 11, ll. 50-58). However, Lee does not disclose or suggest the claimed coating thickness of from about 0.25 to about 1.5


¹ U.S. Patent No. 6,284,856 to Lee (Lee '856) is a C-I-P of U.S. Patent No. 5,993,923 to Lee (Lee '923), which was cited in the previous Office Action. Applicants' previous response indicated that a typical thickness of the coating of Lee '923 was 6 to 10 mils. However, as noted above, Lee '856 indicates that a typical thickness of natural and nitrile articles is 150 to 250 microns (~ 6 to 10 mils). Thus, the ambiguous reference to thickness in Lee '923 appears to have referred to the thickness of the article instead of the coating. In any event, however, neither of the references discloses or suggests each limitation of the present claims.

microns. This is clearly recognized in the Office Action, in which dependent claims 3, 30, and 32 were said to be allowable if rewritten into independent form. Thus, for at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 10, and 19 patentably define over Lee.

It is believed that the present application is in complete condition for allowance and favorable action, therefore, is respectfully requested. Examiner Welch is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned, however, should any issues remain after consideration of this response. Please charge any additional fees required by this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 04-1403.

Respectfully requested,

DORITY & MANNING, P.A.



Jason W. Johnston
Registration No. 45,675

DORITY & MANNING, P.A.
P. O. Box 1449
Greenville, SC 29602-1449
Phone: (864) 271-1592
Facsimile: (864) 233-7342

Date: 8/9/04